

HELLE METSLANG (Helsinki—Tallinn)

IMPERATIVE AND RELATED MATTERS IN EVERYDAY ESTONIAN

Abstract. The article deals with the use of the imperative and the jussive and the expression of directivity in everyday Estonian. The imperative may also be used to express an indirect command (although the jussive or the conditional could be used) and a modalized statement. Some formulas and particles develop from the imperative forms via lexicalization and/or grammaticalization. Besides the imperative, there are other means of expressing various nuances of a command. As a general rule, commands are usually softened so as to take the form of proposals or requests, whereas stronger, more direct forms are rarely used. The main strategies for softening commands include avoidance of straightforward directivity (modalized statements, questions; the conditional mood) and direct reference to the addressee of the command (subjectless sentences, experiential sentences, ambiguous personal forms).

1. Introduction

Commands and other directive speech acts are commonly expressed by means of the imperative (verb form) and the command (sentence type). At the same time directivity, the wish to influence someone's behaviour by means of language is a communication function that is used in a number of ways and nuanced by using various means of expression. On the other hand, the use of the imperative goes beyond the framework of expressing commands. Similarly to the formal means of any natural language, the use of the imperative undergoes shifts by starting to express related meanings and functions and fossilizing into new units and constructions. The article deals with the use of the imperative and the jussive in Estonian everyday conversations and the expression of direct and reported directivity in spoken Estonian.

1.1. Grammatical means of expressing direct and indirect commands

Estonian has two moods for expressing commands (for a more detailed discussion see Erelt, Metslang 2004). The function of the imperative is to express direct commands. The paradigm of the Estonian imperative in the present, affirmative, and active is as follows: (*sa*) *istu* '(you) sit down', (*ta*)

istu-gu '(he) should sit down', (*me*) *istu-gem/istu-me* 'let's sit down', (*te*) *istu-ge* '(you) sit down', (*nad*) *istu-gu* '(they) should sit down'. The original form of the 1st person plural (*istu-gem* 'let's sit', *ooda-kem* 'let's wait') is rarely used; instead the indicative is common (*istu-me* 'we sit', *oota-me* 'we wait'). The *gu-/ku*-marked form of the 3rd person remains the same in the singular and the plural; also, the periphrastic construction with the particle *las* (*las ta istub* 'let him sit', *las nad ootavad* 'let them wait') occurs in the same function. The *gu-/ku*-form serves at the same as the form of the entire jussive paradigm: *ma/sa/ta/me/te/nad istugu* 'I'm/you're/he's/ we're/you're/ they're told to sit'. The main functions of the jussive (for a more detailed discussion see Erelt 2002) are to express the indirect command, obligation, and concessivity. Third, one of the functions of the conditional is express the reported command, which is similar to the subjunctive in many languages (Palmer 2001 : 138—144; the form and functions of the Estonian conditional in everyday speech has been dealt with in Pajusalu, Pajusalu 2004).

Estonian reveals an increasing tendency not to distinguish between personal forms. Thus, forms like *istu-ks* 'would sit', *oota-ks* 'would wait' are rather common in all the forms and are also acceptable in the standard language. At the same time, the study by the Pajusalus shows that one cannot claim that the absence of a personal ending is always quickly compensated by the use of a pronoun or some explicit subject.

A typical command (1) contains an imperative form. A clause with the imperative form is in essence neutral; the intensity of the expressed command can be varied by intonational and lexical means. The particle *palun* 'please', e.g. *Palun istu siia!* 'please sit down over here' is a universal means of politeness. Other structures of the imperative clause include clauses with the *da*-infinitive predicate (2), verbless clauses (3), and various formulas (4). The latter usually express an intensive command.

- (1) *Istu siia!* 'sit over here'
- (2) *Siia istuda!* 'sit here'
- (3) *Kiiresti siia!* 'quickly (to) here'
- (4) *Stopp!* 'stop'

The previous treatments based on the standard language (EKG 175—177; Metslang 1981 : 109—112; 2004; МЕТСЛАНГ 1985) also single out such secondary means of expressing imperativeness adding specific shades of meaning as the question (5, 6), modalized declarative sentence (7), and indicative clause (8).

- (5) *Kas sa saaksid siia istuda?* 'could you sit over here'
- (6) *Miks sa sohvale ei istu?* 'why don't you sit on the sofa'
- (7) *Sa peaksid nüüd koju minema* 'you should go home now'
- (8) *Sa lähed kohe koju!* 'you'll go home right away'

1.2. The Data

The analysis is based on the everyday conversation section of the Corpus of Spoken Estonian at the University of Tartu, which consists of transcribed extracts from 72 conversations, altogether 392 occurrences of commands and the imperative. Renate and Karl Pajusalu (2004) used the same mini-corpus of everyday conversations for the study of the conditional. Table 1 shows the distribution between direct and indirect commands and the

imperative and the other means. In addition to the commands, the data included 110 imperative forms in other functions. The following analysis is qualitative, and statistical data have been presented selectively.

Table 1

Commands in the corpus of everyday conversations					
Directness/indirectness of a command	Imperative (jussive) occurrences		Other occurrences		Total
Direct command	136	48.2 %	108	38.3 %	244
Reported command	25	8.9 %	13	4.6 %	38
Total	161	57.1 %	121	42.9 %	282

2. Functions of the imperative (jussive)

Table 2 below presents the frequencies of the main occurrences of the imperative in the analysed material.

2.1. Direct command

Direct command is the function of half of all the occurrences of the imperative and the jussive.

Among the personal forms the 2nd person plural is predominant; all the other personal forms are much less frequent. The 2nd person singular is used to address the recipient (9); calls to act together in the we-form are less common (10). The corpus did not reveal any instances of the use of the polite plural form of 'you'; the second person plural stands for more than one recipient (11). In most cases the content of the command concerns something that is happening in the same place and at the same time (9, 11).

(9) V: *a n n a=see nuga siia 'g i v e* this knife here'

E: *taga kapis* (1.2) 'back in the cupboard'

(10) L: *kule Marili, (0.5) tule Tallinna ja l ä h m e* *Mardi juurde sauna* (.) 'listen, Marili, come to Tallinn and l e t ' s g o to Mart for a sauna'

M: *präägu=vä* ((naer)) 'just now or (laughter)'

L: *omme* 'tomorrow'

M: *hehe mine üks, mina ei lähe* 'eh eh, I won't go there alone'

(11) H: *v õ t k e mõni jututeema 'ü l e s siis* 'take up some topic of conversation then'

K: *noh* (0.5) '*mina=i=tea* (1.0) 'well, I don't know'

The *me*-ending form is the only imperative form of the 1st person plural in everyday conversations. However, there are some ambiguous cases of imperative and indicative interpretations (12): the semantic field of the *me*-form includes the command, suggestion, and planning statement; uncertainty that blurs directivity is also likely to be a background factor of the functional shift of the indicative form (see Erelt, Metslang 2004).

(12) Ke: *kas me seda tõlkimistööd* 'shall we take this translation job'

Kr: *võtame ikka*. (.) *võtame ikka järgmine kord t e e m e g i seda* 'Sure, let's take it for sure, next time w e ' l l b e d o i n g just this'

The affirmative form predominates in terms of *polarity*; the possibilities to use prohibition (13) are limited, which is characteristic of the pragmatic use of negative expressions (see Sang 1983 : 16–19). Also, the affirmative construction with the verb *hakkama* 'start, begin' carries a prohibitive meaning (14).

- (13) E: *täpselt ilus ja tark prostit[uit]* 'precisely a beautiful and clever prostitute'
 (-): [oi] *jumal* (.) 'oh, God'
 E: *nagu nad on kõik* (.) 'like they all are'
 Ö: *aeih* 'oh'
 R: *hehe* 'ah ah'
 E: *ja siis* 'and then'
 V: *kule ä r a r ä ä g i = nüüd, palun no jäta noh=s, jäta järgi, no tõesti, no sa räägid täitsa rumalusi ajad praegu suust välja* 'listen d o n ' t s p e a k now, please stop it'
 E: *no minule ei meeldind* (1.2) 'well, I didn't like it'
- (14) S: *kellele kurat seda vaja läheb* (.) 'who the heck will need it'
 J: *ei kellelegi* (1.1) *ei kellegile* (.) 'noone, no noone'
 S: *mjah* 'I see'
 M: *jaa* [*h a k k a m e*] *nüüd* [*v a i d l e m a*] [*hehe*] ((lõbusalt (2.1)))
 'let's now start to argue' (merrily)
 J: [*sin*] [*jaa hehe*] *jah ei kellegile* (.)
sin on jah [*see {-} ka*] 'yes, noone. Here is yes this also'
 S: [*kellegile või kellelegi*] ((torisedes)) 'someone' (grumbling)

Thus, it is rather characteristic of everyday conversations that a command is expressed in the most direct way by means of the imperative without any softening linguistic means (with the exception of intonation). The particle *palun* 'please' (13) that softens the command occurred only twice in the entire material. The command is intensified by repeating the imperative verb form (15).

- (15) M: *hehe* [*mine üks, mina ei lähe*] 'uh uh, go alone, I won't come'
 L: [*äh* (.) *mhmh*] *ei* 'uh, yeah, no'
 T: *mine Marili, mine = mine* (.) 'go Marili, go go'
 M: *ei lähe*, (0.5) *ei lähe* 'no, I won't go, won't go'

2.2. Reported command

Although the expression of evidentiality is characteristic of Estonian grammar, in everyday conversations one does not change direct speech into indirect speech. The jussive is not used instead the imperative, deictic orientation remains unchanged, and personal forms and pronouns remain the same, too. Spoken language prefers to refer to reported speech by means of reporting clauses or other lexico-syntactic means (16). Similarly to a direct command (12), also in the case of an indirect command it often remains unclear whether the *we*-form refers to a command or a planning statement (17).

- (16) T: *ma olen* (.) *selles kursuse listis, kus pidevalt keegi laterdab jälle sel teemal ja võetakse vastu* (.) *jälle piparkoogipidu ja vintergeims tuleb ja t u l g e jälle=ja* 'I'm belong in the list of this course, where someone keeps blabbering again about this theme and it is accepted that there will be a gingerbread party and winter games and c o m e again and'

- (17) R: *tuleb järgmine võim [ekssole, (.) leiab-et]* 'there will be a new power, ain't it, and it will find that'
 E: [---] *tehakse (---)* 'it's done'
 R: *poold politseinikud tuleb koondada* (0.8) 'half of the police officers have to be declared redundant'
 E: *mhmh* 'I see'
 R: *siis ekssole see koondamine tähendab kogu struktuuri ringi ehitamist.* (0.5) *siis tuleb üks ekssole see oli vale.* (0.5) *nüüd võtame uuesti tagasi* (0.8) 'then isn't it so that cutting back means rebuilding the whole system then comes one isn't it so that was wrong now let's take back again'

The jussive has been used once with regard to the first person singular (18); the second reported message (19) provides two possibilities for interpretation: the jussive or the 3rd person imperative.

- (18) L: ((vihase häälega)) *kuula siis* (.) '(angrily), listen then'
 M: *kuulakumajah.* (3.0) *mis=sa ütlesid=ä* (.) 'I should listen yes what did you say'
 L: *khh kurt oled=vä* (.) 'uh are deaf or what'
 (19) B: *õõ see ((lindi defekt)) õõ pangu obune ette* (.) *ja=ja lähme sel päeval linnas, tädi põlnud linnas elus elus käind* 'uh (faulty tape) the horse should be hitched and on that day we ride to town, aunt had never before been to town in her life'

2.3. In the other uses of the imperative the directive function is absent or in the background.

In addition to expressing the command, the imperative is also used for expressing statements with necessitive modality (20).

- (20) *kell on puol viis, Sillamäelt elistavad, (.) üks ust ei saa lahti.* (1.0) 'kolm meest on valves, ei saa ust lahti see arilik see mis need lukud on. sõidame Sillamäele. (1.0) *snepper ei tüüta.* (1.5) *keratorutangidega see südamik jälle l a h - t i = j a = s i s = v õ t a = t e a d* (3.5) *no ukse lukkude peale ma=ei=tea palju nüüd seda raha on läind seal* 'it's half past four, there's a call from Sillamäe, the door won't open, three men are on duty, this usual on, what kind of locks are they, we drive to Sillamäe, the cylinder lock won't work, you have to open this core again with the pipe wrench and then you'll take you know I don't know how much this money has been spent on locks'

Modality and conditionality are combined in the construction with the meaning 'if A, then B'. The precondition is expressed by means the imperative, which can be interpreted as permission: you can do A but the result is B. The result may not be expressed.

- (21) B: *linnas on niukene asi=et kui on neid kuskil rohkem siis t i l g u t a enna kuskile palderjani nattuke maha* (.) *ja on terve=see marsa sial kuus ja aeevad sääl ja juua täis sääl* (.) *kassid* (.) *jah* 'in town there is such a thing that if there are more of them drop some valerian on the ground and the whole pack is there together and they're wallowing and drunk there, cats yes'

The combination of two communicative functions can be seen in the positive answers to suggestions or intentions (22), which are at the same time statements and commands, and combi-

nations of commands and questions (23), which at the same time recommend to do something and ask for the recipient's agreement.

- (22) V: *no kas=sa=i söögi=või* (.) 'well how come that you don't eat'
 R: *ma mõtlen*, (0.5) *praegu ei söö* (2.5) 'I don't think that I'm going to eat now'
 V: *ä r a s ö ö jah* 'don't eat, yes'
- (23) K: *Märt elistas* 'Märt called'
 G: *mis tuu* 'what (does) he (want)'
 K: *sauna tahab* 'he wants (to come to) the sauna'
 G: *tu le ka=v ä* 'will he come, too'
 Ka: *mhemhe* '(no idea)'

2.4. Uses with shifted meanings and fixed forms (formulas, particles)

2.4.1. The imperative forms of some verbs have given rise to formulas — fossilized constructions with a set lexico-grammatical composition and a shifted meaning. The purpose of constructions where the imperative form *vaata* 'look' is an extended subordinate clause (24) or has a partitive noun phrase (25) is to draw attention to what the subordinate clause or noun denotes. Beside the informal you form also other personal forms are used.

- (24) K: *v a a d a k e kus mul visati praegu jootraha allatulemise eest* (.) 'look how much tip I earned for coming down'
 R: *vauu? hehe peaks kogu aeg käima* 'wow, you'd have to go all the time'
- (25) M: *jaa jaa. mingi akne ei ole ültse [mingi] eksistentsiaalne [probleem]* 'yes, yes, some sort of acne is not at all an existential problem'
 K: [jaa jaa] [v a a t a v a a t a]
neid Modelle, need on ju (.) *suisa puhta näoga* 'yes, yes look, look at these models, actually they have totally clean faces'

The main purposes of the fossilized imperative expressions in everyday conversations are to respond with a surprise or rejection to the interlocutor's statements (negative forms of utterance verbs: *ära jutusta* 'don't talk', *ära lobise* 'don't chatter', *ära tee nalja* 'stop joking'; constructions with the verb *üttelema* 'say' (*üttele nüüd* 'say now') and *minema* 'go' (*mine nüüd*, *mine* 'come on' together with a locative expression); *looda sa* 'lit. hope you', *jumal hoidku* 'God forbid', *las olla* 'let it be', etc.).

2.4.2. Particled/particling imperative forms (see Henno 2000; Keevallik 2003) are highly common in everyday conversations. Most of them have developed from the affirmative 2nd person forms of cognition verbs: *vaata/vata/vat* 'look', *kuule/kule* 'listen' (10), *vahi* 'look', *kae* 'look', *mõttele* 'think', *kujuta ette* 'imagine' and some other verbs such as *anna* 'give' and *oota/ota/oot/ot* 'wait', *vabandage* 'excuse'.

- (26) B: *ja=ja ronis lauda katuselle* (.) *ja karjus seal meheed meheed* ((*kitse imiteerides*))
sis=on (.) *käib ühelt poolt teisel=poole [ja]* 'and and climbed on the cowshed roof and shouted there men men (imitating a goat)'
 A: [o o t a g a] *katus on ju viilkatus,*
kus ta seal käia sai siis 'wait but the roof is a gable roof, where was it possible for him to walk then'
 B: *üleval selle katuse ee viilu peal üleval käib* (.) 'up he walks on the gable of this roof up there'

2.5. Concluding remarks concerning the imperative

A comparison of the frequencies of some formal and content-related characteristics of various occurrences of the imperative in the corpus (Table 2) reveals different proportions of the 2nd person singular. Although in conversations usually explicit directivity is addressed mainly at the interlocutor, a quarter of the occurrences concern the other persons. The reported command is unrelated to the conversational situation, and the proportion of the other persons is much greater there. However, lexicalization and grammaticalization into formulas and particles involves mostly the affirmative forms of the 2nd person singular. The proportion of prohibition is ca 10 per cent and small in all the groups; the number of direct prohibitions, however, is slightly more than the average.

Does the imperative prefer some situation type in the usage? The material confirms that the most important restriction is agentivity of the action. Ordinary language does not know such imperatives of verbs with passive content as *võida!* 'win', which has been imported into advertising language. Stative sentences such as 27 are rare as imperatives, and even in such instances the subject cannot be regarded fully passive.

- (27) M: *et tahab nagu aga ei julge-vä* 'that seems to want but doesn't dare'
 L: *mhh 'o l e 'vait 's h u t u p'* (lit. 'be silent')

Table 2

Occurrences, forms, and situation types of the imperative (jussive) in the analysed material

Usage type	Total No. of occurrences	Person		Polarity		Situation type			
		2Sg	other	affirmative	negative	state	activity	accomplishment	achievement
Directive direct imperative	136	99	37	118	18	3	49	45	35
Directive reporting imperative	25	11	14	23	2	0	5	14	10
Non-directive imperative	26	22	4	25	1	0	11	9	6
Formulas, particles	84	81	3	80	4	1	79	2	2
Total	271	213	58	246	25	4	144	70	53

All three dynamic situation types (atelic and durative — activity, telic and durative — accomplishment, telic and momentaneous — achievement, see Vendler 1967) are represented to various degrees. All three are represented rather evenly as direct commands and secondary uses of the imperative, for example, activity (22), accomplishment (20), and achievement (11). Commands to carry out something are reported most of all: accomplishment (16) and achievement (17). However, most of all cognition verbs and other imperfective activity verbs undergo lexicalization and grammaticalization (*kuule* 'listen', *vaata* 'look', *oota* 'wait', *mõtle* 'think', etc.)

3. Other devices for expressing commands

The imperative form is absent from a large part of direct commands in the material. In the case of imperative commands usually the content generally corresponds to the form both by explicit directivity, person as affirmation or negation, and the softening and intensification of the command is rare. On the other hand, use of other means of expression diversifies the possibilities to nuance the command, creative use of linguistic devices, oppositions of the content and form, and variation of the pragmatic aspect of the command. Table 3 below presents the statistical data about non-imperative direct commands.

3.1. Verbless commands

Of the clause structures (see 1.1) only the verbless sentence was represented in everyday conversations with example 28. However, because the verb is absent, the agent of the sentence remains vague; the recipient can be identified with the help of the context or remain vague.

- (28) Kä: *`m u l l e `k a v õ i d* ((täis suuga)) ((keegi ei ulata))
's o m e b u t t e r t o m e, t o o' (with one's mouth full) (noone passes it)

3.2. Use of other devices for the expression of commands

There are also other sentence types that may express a command if they are related to the content of the command and its conditions of use (see Metslang 1981 : 109–112; Метсланг 1985).

3.2.1. Modalized declarative sentence. The meaning of a command includes deontic modality. Because of the shared modal part the command and the modalized statement can fulfil each other's function, see above 2.3. A declarative sentence, however, provides ample softening possibilities. In addition to absence of directivity, a direct reference to the agent, that is the recipient, can be avoided in a number of ways: generic statements (29, 31), experiential clauses without an agent subject (29), absence of reference to the person in the conditional (30), and in many other verb forms. That is how directivity to the recipient is masked. A sentence informs only that it would be necessary, desirable, or good if the denoted action takes place. The implied agent is usually the listener, sometimes also the listener together with the speaker; the interpretations of we and you may remain indistinguishable. Also the we-form or interpretation (31) can be used as a politeness device, seemingly uniting the speaker with the listener (see Erelt 1990 : 36). In both modalized and non-modalized (see below) statements the command is often softened by means of the conditional, too (see Pajusalu, Pajusalu 2004).

- (29) Kr: *selles mõttes et=e kui seda tundi on nii vähe sis sa p e a d t õ e s t i (t õ õ - t a m a) k õ v a s t i k o d u s* (.) ise (0.5) 'in the sense that if there are so few classes of this subject, than you'll have to work really hard at home'
M: *va-andust* (.) 'excuse (me)'
Ke: *mhmh* (0.5) 'uh'
Kr: *selle- sellepärast (noh) t u l e b n e i d h a r j u t u s i k a t e h a j a n i i* (.) *võibolla tunduvad igavana vahest aga* (0.5) 'for this reason (well) o n e

has to do those exercises too and so, perhaps they seem
ancient perhaps but'

(30) R: *ei=jole*. (1.5) *kule Tutu kuna sa sinna* (.) *Lärmide poole lähäd?* (0.8) 'no, listen
Tutu because you'll go to those Lärms' place'

V: *ma=i=tea* (.) 'I don't know'

R: *miks* (1.8) 'why'

E: *mida tegema* (.) 'do what'

R: *nh see pilt mis ma seal tegin, see peaks ära
viima* (1.2) 'the picture that I took there, one
should take it away'

E: *mh na mäletava ise ka enda nägu* (1.2) 'they remember themselves, too,
their own faces'

(31) A: *vaevalt elab ära* 'one can hardly make both ends meet'

B: *noh loomulikult kui siuksed hinnad on*. (1.8) 'well, naturally if the prices are
what they are'

A: *nii=et sin ega meie sa enam nuriseda midagi=sin*,
(0.5) *varsti on* 'so that here actually we can't grumble here
any more'

B: *miks ei saa* 'why can't we'

A: *elu normaalne kurat* (.) 'life (is) normal damn (it)'

B: *saab küll nuriseda* (2.5) 'one can grumble'

A: *nojah* (0.5) *tuleb tööle hakata, siis pole vaja
nuriseda* (3.0) 'well one has to get down to work,
then you won't have to grumble'

B: *mis see nüüd oli vihje-vä* (2.0) 'what was it now, was it a hint or'

A: *otsene* (1.0) *hehe* 'direct'

3.2.2. Non-modalized statements. The corpus material shows that the description of the future action of the speaker or the speaker and the listener in the indicative or the conditional is another possibility to soften the demand. Such a sentence would discuss and plan things rather than issue a command. In the case of the conditional it is again possible to avoid the reference to the person (33). Of the lexical means the particle *eks*, which asks for the listener's consent, softens directivity (32).

(32) L: *ise sa pärast kirjutad need sõnad ülesse eks* (.)
'afterwards you'll write down these words, won't you'
S: *mhemhe okei* 'uh uh OK'

(33) Eli: *võtaks siis esimeseks selle laulu vä* 'perhaps
we we'll take this song as the first one or'

Kat: *jah*. (...) *laul*. (...) 'yes, the song'

At the same time, an indicative sentence can present a command in a harsher manner if there is a lexical reference to categoricalness or quickness of action (8, 34) etc.

(34) U: *sina võid küll siin praegu naerda ja teha nalja o-omaarust=aga* ((naerdakse))
(0.8) 'you may have a laugh and have your fun here, but' (someone is laughing)

U: *a=homme oled giid nigu tead viis kopikat, või senti
meil on nüüd sendid jah* 'but tomorrow you'll be a guide
like five kopecks or cents, we have cents now yes'

Kr: *he he* 'ah ah'

3.2.3. Performative clause. The speaker expresses his/her volition, wish, hope, opinion, etc., which shows that the recipient of the command is expected to implement it. The corpus did not reveal any explicitly directive performative verbs (*käskima* 'order', *nõudma* 'demand'), and the wishes were often masked as descriptions of the anticipated situation (35).

- (35) M: *ma tahan seda (kuulata)=palun* 'I want (to listen to) it, please'
L: *palun* 'please'

In example 36 the performative clause is added to other softening devices: weakening modalization, use of the conditional, and ambiguity of the personal form.

- (36) K: *ei no tühja sest ma loodan et kalapulki võiks teha* (.)
'actually it doesn't matter because I think we could prepare fish fingers'
P: *kalapulki jah* (.) 'yes, fish fingers'

3.2.4. Interrogative sentences are of two kinds: a yes/no question expresses a proposal, and a wh-question expresses prohibition.

3.2.4.1. A yes/no question presents a command concerning the action of the recipient. Usually it is a purely informative and neutral suggestion, where the question form adds anticipation of a response with an option (37). It seems that accumulation of softening devices, as in the classic example *Kas te ei võiks mulle soola ulatada?* 'could you pass me the salt' (modalization, conditional, opposite polarity) is not common in everyday conversations. The only example of a direct command (38) and an example of a report below (46) are actually not serious.

- (37) A: *oota=aga Eve kas sa tantsid meile ka siis niimodi. flamenkot=vä* 'wait, but Eve will you dance to us like this, too, flamenco or'

- (38) M: *Meelis Pinn* (.) *kõigepealt kui=me alustame intervjuud kas=te võiks ite öelda oma pin koodi* 'Meelis Pinn: first of all when we begin the interview, could you tell me your PIN number'
J: *noo se=on salastatud ausalt=öeldes* (.) 'well, frankly speaking, it's classified'

3.2.4.2. Wh-question. One asks about the reason or some circumstance of the recipient's action in order to show the unfoundedness or inappropriateness of the action, which results in prohibition (see Metslang 1981 : 111). The recipient's action is regarded as unreasonable; thus, one is not dealing with a politeness device. Prohibition is often intensified with the particle *siis* 'then'. A prohibitive construction with a broad meaning has developed on the basis of the question word *mis* 'what' (see R. Pajusalu, forthcoming).

- (39) E: *varsti on kohvi ka naha vahele joodud* (1.0) 'soon we have drunk up also the coffee'
R: *mis=te joote=sis nisi palju* 'why do you drink then so much'
E: *lrrr* ((luristab)) *ähh* (0.3) *mis=sa muud teed* (0.5) '(slurping) ah, what else can you do'

3.2.5. An answer to a question or discussion concerning the necessity of the action or action itself (cf. 2.3) includes a recommendation for action, being a combination of a statement and command.

- (40) T: *kule kas=see uksekaunistus tuleb ka ära võtta=vä* (.) 'listen, do we have to remove this door decoration as well or'
A: *m h m h* (.) 'uh-u h'

3.2.6. Some constructions with the directive function. The data included two fixed structures: 1) *kui*-clause (see Matihaldi 1979) — a clause resembling a conditional clause that expresses a suggestion (41), which may have developed from a question that expresses a suggestion as *Kuidas oleks, kui paneks sellesamaga?* 'what if we put it with the same'; 2) existential sentences with a verbal noun with the proposition SIIN ON/TOIMUB/KÄIB V_{MINE} 'here is going on a V_{ing}'. The verbal noun denotes the action of the recipient of the command; prohibition is inferred from the *mis*-question (42) or the declarative sentence denying existence. The form of the sentence makes the prohibition more categorical while the absence of reference to the agent has a softening effect.

- (41) (people are exploring the spread that could be put on the toast)
JN: *juustu on sisse riivitud* 'some grated cheese has been added'
IN: *mhmh* (2.0) 'uh uh'
UP: *midagi head* 'something good'
UP: *a=ku paneks sellesamaga* (2.0) 'what if we used the same one'
(42) K: *mis=e mis musitamine siin käib päise päeva ajal*
'what kind of kissing is going on here in broad daylight'

3.2.7. In addition, directivity can be inferred from highly different utterances that comment on the action of the recipient or its absence. In that case the propositional content of the command has been concealed in addition to directivity and the reference to the agent — the result is usually a cautious suggestion.

- (43) S: *ei see on lihtsalt kaheksateistkümnenda sajandi mõisahärra* 'no, he's just an eighteenth-century lord of the manor'
K: *hehe* (.) 'uh uh'
L: *me polegi ammu mingisugust ümberriietumist teind* 'actually we haven't changed any clothes for ages'
S: *õudne [jama]* 'too bad'
L: [vata] *viimati oli siis kui* (.) 'look the last time was when'
S: *peaks tegema* 'should do (it)'

3.2.8. A command projected into the past. The imperative has no grammatical form that could refer to the past. Nevertheless, it is possible to express the so-called imaginary imperative (Ахманова 1966 : 249; see also Metslang, Muižniece, Pajusalu 1999 : 132, 147) by means of the past reference of declarative and interrogative sentences — recommendations for imaginary action in the past.

(44) R: *m i k s = s a* (.) *m i k s = s a t e e d e i o s t n u d l a o s t*. *Aagel on otsas*
'why didn't you buy tea from the storehouse. It has
run out at Haage'

V: *sääl ei ole* (.) 'you can't find it there'

One typical case is expressions of reproach and regret (Pajusalu, Pajusalu 2004), where the predicate reveals deontic modality and is in the perfect conditional. In example (45) also the use of the modal verb *võima* 'may; can' softens directivity.

(45) V: *mina=i julgend osta [teda]* 'I didn't dare to buy it'

E: [tii] *tii vett jah.*= 'tea water yes'

R: *o l e k s v õ i n d o s t a*. (.) *see kristmaste e ka päris ea=aga ta=on selline*
'you might have bought (it), this Christmas tea is also rather
good, but it is such a'

V: *nood ei olnd, nood olid mingi muu=h* 'they weren't, they were something
different'

3.3. Expression of a reported command

Similarly to the imperative, in everyday conversations in non-imperative commands direct speech is not converted into indirect speech (46). In the data most of the above-mentioned secondary devices were used to express reported commands.

(46) J: *ähäh*, (0.5) *mina ütlesin talle kohe ära, et kui minule kallale tuli*, (0.5) *kule*
k a s s a o l e k s i d n i i k e n a j a k a s s a e i e s i n e k s n a g u
m e i e k o o l i e e s t, ma ütlesin=et ei tõesti, mina ei esine 'uh uh, I told
him right away when he attacked me, listen, would you be so kind
and would you perform as if on behalf of our
school, I said that really, I'm not going to perform'

3.4. Concluding remarks about the non-imperative command

The material on everyday conversations reveals a diversity of devices for the expression of commands and their combinations. In most cases the secondary expression devices serve to soften the command by concealing or blurring directivity, projection to the recipient, softening deontic modality by using the conditional and a verb with a weaker modal meaning, etc. Some devices for expressing prohibition, however, are used for intensification (wh-question and deverbal construction). Usually the speaker is the actual recipient of the command. However, he or she does not predominate among the recipients as prominently as in the case of imperative commands. The recipient may, in fact, remain to a certain degree vague. In terms of different modes of expression the verb semantics did not reveal any tendencies. All three classes of dynamic situations according to Vendler were evenly represented through different occurrences. The results of the analysis of everyday language partly overlapped with the ways of expressing and nuancing commands in the standard language. On the other hand, one cannot find here some devices that seek extreme politeness, and, third, there are such combinations of functions that have not been observed so far in previous studies.

Table 3

Non-imperative utterances in the corpus that express direct commands

Type	Occurrences	Recipient of the command					Agent unspecified	Prohibition
		2Sg	1Pl	2Sg/1Pl	Other person	Unspecified		
Verbless command	4	1			3		4	0
Modalized statement	42	21	7	6	3	5	23	4
Declarative sentence	19	8	10	1			0	2
Performative clause	9	4	1	3	2		7	1
Question	15	10	3	1	1		1	7
Other	19	11	1	1	1	4	4	4
Total	108	55	22	12	10	9	39	18

4. Conclusion

The imperative is the main device for the expression of commands in everyday conversation. Such a command is neutral and is usually not softened or strengthened. A command can be nuanced by means of other clause types. The most common type is the modalized statement that provides many possibilities for variously graded suggestions, recommendations, etc. by means of different modal verbs, moods, variation of persons, etc. Here one can find the most explicit use of linguistic vagueness, which is revealed also in other ways of expressing commands: the linguistic form does not show explicitly whether the utterance is directive, descriptive, or interrogative, whether the listener and the speaker are together or the speaker is alone, whether the agent is general or vague. Such things can be specified by communicative competence. The selection of devices in everyday conversations is somewhat different from those in the standard language, for example, the particle *palun* 'please' was extremely rare. An affirmative command is mostly nuanced by means of softening; in the case of prohibition one can also find some strengthening devices (*wh*-question and deverbal constructions). Particization is the most common secondary use of the imperative. In spoken language the expression of a reported command does not generally differ from that of a direct command; the jussive or the quotative are not used.

Abbreviations

EKG — M. Erelt, R. Kasik, H. Metslang, H. Rajandi, K. Ross, H. Saari, K. Tael, S. Vare, Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks. Lisa: kiri, Tallinn 1993.

REFERENCES

- Erelt, M. 1990, Kõneleja ja kuulaja kaudse väljendamise võimalusi eesti keeles. — KK, 35–39.
 ——— 2002, Does Estonian Have the Jussive? — LU, 110–117.

- Erelt, M., Metslang, H. 2004, Grammar and Pragmatics: Changes in the Paradigm of the Estonian Imperative. — LU, 161—178.
- Hennoste, T. 2000, Sissejuhatus suulisesse eesti keelde IV. Suulise kõne erisõnavara 3. Artiklid. — Akadeemia, 1773—1806.
- Keevalik, L. 2003, From Interaction to Grammar. Estonian Finite Verb Forms in Conversation, Uppsala (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 34).
- Matihaldi, H.-L. 1979, Nykysuomen modukset I, Oulu (Acta Universitatis Ouluensis, Series B, Humaniora 7, Philologica 2).
- Metslang, H. 1981, Kõsilause eesti keeles, Tallinn.
- 2004, Imperative and Related Matters in Estonian and Finnish (Seminar presentation on symposium Grammar and Politeness in the Finnic and Circumbaltic Area, Paris 14 May 2004).
- Metslang, H., Muižniece, L., Pajusalu, K. 1999, Past Participle Finitization in Estonian and Latvian. — Estonian: Typological Studies III, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 11), 128—157.
- Pajusalu, R. (forthcoming), *mis*-konstruktsioon. Mis konstruktsioon? — Toimiv keel III. Töid rakenduslingvistika alalt, Tallinn.
- Pajusalu, R., Pajusalu, K. 2004, The Conditional in Everyday Estonian: Its Forms and Functions (This volume).
- Palmér, F. R. 2001, Mood and Modality, Cambridge (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics).
- Sang, J. 1983, Eitus eesti keeles, Tallinn.
- Vendler, Z. 1967, Linguistics in Philosophy, Comell.
- Ахманова, О. С. 1966, Словарь лингвистических терминов, Москва.
- Метсланг, Х. 1985, Система коммуникативных типов предложений в эстонском языке, Таллин.

ХЕЛЛЕ МЕТСЛАНГ (Хельсинки—Таллинн)

ИМПЕРАТИВ И СВЯЗАННЫЕ С НИМ ЯВЛЕНИЯ В ЭСТОНСКОМ РАЗГОВОРНОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

В статье рассматривается употребление императива и юссива, а также выражение директивности в повседневных беседах на эстонском языке. Наряду с прямым повелением императив используется и для реферирования повеления (хотя опосредованность повеления можно выразить грамматически и с помощью юссива или кондиционалиса). С помощью императива передается и недирективная модальность должествования. На базе императива путем лексикализации и грамматики образовались некоторые застывшие выражения и частицы. С другой стороны, для передачи повеления в различной степени его интенсивности используются и иные языковые средства. Чаще встречаются варианты смягченного приказания (предложения, просьбы), усиленный, интенсивный приказ употребляется редко. Основные стратегии смягчения приказания состоят в сокрытии директивности (модализированные повествовательные предложения, вопросительные предложения, использование кондиционалиса) и в избегании прямого упоминания адресата (разные бессубъектные предложения, глагольные формы без однозначного указания лица).